

THE REMONSTRANCE.

BOSTON, JULY, 1913

The Remonstrance is published quarterly by the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women. It expresses the views of women in Massachusetts, Maine, Rhode Island, New York, Illinois, Iowa, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Connecticut, Maryland, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont, New Jersey, Wisconsin, Ohio, Virginia and other states.

Any one who desires to receive the quarterly numbers for one year can do so by enclosing 25 cents in stamps to the Treasurer,

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN,
Walnut St., Brookline.

Information in regard to The Remonstrance and other publications of the Association may be obtained from the Secretary, Room 615, Kensington Building, Boston.

ANOTHER SUFFRAGE WATER- LOO

The suffrage cause has experienced its third Waterloo in the middle West in the short period of seven months.

September 3, 1912, the voters of Ohio rejected a proposed suffrage amendment to the constitution by a majority of 87,455. November 5, 1912, a similar amendment was defeated in Wisconsin by a majority of 91,479. April 7, in Michigan, a suffrage amendment which had been rejected last November by a majority of only 760, being resubmitted, was defeated by a majority of 96,144. At this rate, the next anti-suffrage majority in the middle West may be expected to mount up to 100,000.

The suffragists attempt to explain this crushing defeat by the opposition of the liquor interests. But, if this explanation were the true one, the majorities against suffrage should be chiefly in the cities, where the liquor interests are strong. But the fact is that they were distributed over the state, in the rural counties as well as the more populous, in the "dry" counties as well as in the "wet."

Through the courtesy of the Michigan Secretary of State, THE REMONSTRANCE has the official figures, not only of the vote on the suffrage

amendment, but on local option. In the entire state, there were majorities for suffrage in only 16 counties out of 83. Out of twelve counties which voted on local option, there were six,—Clinton, Genesee, Ionia, Lenawee, Montcalm and Sanilac—which voted "dry." These counties voted also against suffrage,—Clinton by 905 majority, Genesee by 1445, Ionia by 1157, Lenawee by 1618, Montcalm by 976, and Sanilac by 929. Their vote against suffrage can hardly be explained by the strength of the saloon interests since those interests were not strong enough to protect themselves from being driven out.

The real explanation of the change in Michigan is that the conservative women of the state were taken by surprise by the submission of the question last November. The amendment was rushed through the legislature at a special session summoned in mid-summer for a different purpose; and it found the women unorganized. But, before the April election, the anti-suffragists, men and women, had time to organize. They made an effective campaign and succeeded in arousing the people of the state to the real significance of the suffrage movement. The result is read in the April returns.

MRS. BELMONT'S THREAT

On the 5th of April, The Woman's Journal published an American suffragist creed, devised by Beatrice Forbes Robertson, and running as follows:

"I am an American; I live in America.

There never have been militant suffragists in America.

There are no militant suffragists in America.

And there never will be any militant suffragists in America."

At just about this same date, Mrs. O. H. P. Belmont of New York, on the eve of her departure for Europe

to take counsel with Christabel Pankhurst in Paris, gave out to the reporters an interview in which she distinctly threatened that New York suffragists, if they did not get the ballot, would resort to the Pankhurst militant methods. That Mrs. Belmont was not misquoted in these interviews is proved by the fact that, in London, on the 28th of April, in an interview with the correspondent of the Associated Press, she said:

"I meant what I said before leaving the United States. If New York fails to awake, *we shall introduce militant methods of the type used by the Women's Social and Political Union.*"

If this means anything, it means that Mrs. Belmont, one of the foremost American suffrage leaders, and perhaps the chief financial promoter of the suffrage cause in this country, deliberately threatens that American suffragists, if defeated in the legislatures and at the polls, will imitate the window-smashing, mail-destroying, house-burning, bomb-throwing campaign of Mrs. Pankhurst and her English militants.

This open threat is calculated to arouse sane Americans to the real significance of the suffrage movement. In its aims and spirit, and in the latent or active hysteria which characterizes it, the movement is the same in this country that it is in England.

Some of the more prudent suffrage leaders have tried to off-set the bad impression made by Mrs. Belmont's threat by interviews declaring that militant violence is not contemplated in this country. That may be true, in a sense. But Mrs. Belmont's threat shows the drift of things.

DID THE "HIKE" PAY?

Mrs. Maud Wood Park, who took an active part in the suffrage campaign in Michigan, in explaining the causes of the suffrage defeat in an ad-

dress before the Massachusetts Woman Suffrage Association, said, among other things:

"The militancy in England hurt us, and so did the 'hike' of General Rosalie Jones and her pilgrims" (*The Woman's Journal*, April 19).

This is the first time that suffragists have admitted that the suffrage "hikes" to Albany and Washington were anything but an unmixed benefit to the suffrage cause. But it would appear that there were a good many thousand men in Michigan who did not feel that the type of woman represented by the "hikes" would be a steadying and elevating influence in public life.

A WANING CAUSE

That the suffrage movement in England, in spite of suffragette lawlessness and crime,—or, perhaps, partly because of them—is waning, is clearly shown by the votes upon suffrage bills in Parliament.

Up to 1912, it had been the practice of the House of Commons to pass such bills to a second reading by substantial majorities. In 1911, the suffragists had what they described as "an overwhelming victory." Their bill was given a second reading by a vote of 255 to 88,—a suffrage majority of 167.

Last year, there was an abrupt change. In the first week of March, Mrs. Pankhurst and her militants ran amuck through the West End of London, smashing shop windows. Mrs. Pankhurst herself, ringing the bell at Mr. Asquith's residence, threw stones into the hall and broke the windows on the ground floor. One of her followers fired a shot from a revolver through the window of the Colonial Office, and another tried to set fire to the General Post Office.

When the so-called "Conciliation" suffrage bill came up in the House of Commons, March 28, 1912, the vote showed the effect of this hooliganism. The suffrage bill was rejected by a vote of 222 to 208. This showed a loss of 47 suffrage votes and a gain

of 134 anti-suffrage votes as compared with the preceding year.

This year, the vote on the "Dickinson" suffrage bill was taken in the House of Commons May 6th. On the very day of the vote, three suffragettes, in their furious war upon society, burned the beautiful St. Catherine's church in the southeast of London; and another was caught in the act of placing a bomb with a lighted fuse in front of the door of the Grand Hotel. It was expected that the vote would be close, and the suffragists had predicted a victory for their cause. But the bill was rejected by a vote of 266 to 219,—an anti-suffrage majority of 47 in place of a suffrage majority of 167 two years before.

Do not these votes justify the assertion that suffrage is a waning cause in England?

THE MILITANT MANIA

(From *The Boston Herald* June 10, 1913)

The suffragette who madly ran into a fatal accident on the Derby race course may deserve pity, but only persons of her own undesirable temperament can think that she deserves praise. It is ridiculous to eulogize her as a martyr. She did not intend to sacrifice her life for anything. Her purpose was to scare the horses, stop the race, disappoint and irritate the many thousands of people for whom that was the great annual holiday, and then boast of her action and rejoice in her notoriety. But her senseless deed caused her death. And it is not at all creditable, though it is very pitiable.

Anarchy rules the minds of the militants. They are engaged in a campaign of destruction and intimidation, and have proved themselves enemies of law and order. They have proved something else—their unfitness to be voters. That is the damaging blow that they have struck at the cause which they profess to champion. Every true friend of woman suffrage condemns and deplors the antics of these would-be terrorists. Their wanton and indiscriminate destruction of property is a craze that seems to mark them irresponsible. Perhaps the most charitable thought of them is that they are not of sound or sober mind; but are the unfortunate victims of an infectious mania which they have not intelligence enough to resist.

IF THERE are liquor interests anywhere which oppose woman suffrage because they fear that its success will be injurious to them, it must be that they do not realize that the Woman's Christian Temperance Union is no longer the dominating influence in the suffrage leadership. Many present-day suffrage leaders are anxious to separate themselves from temperance influences. They point to the fact that none of the suffrage states have adopted prohibition, and that Colorado defeated a prohibitory amendment last November by a heavy majority. In the Wisconsin campaign, they cut loose from the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and wooed the brewers. In Colorado, they have not only abandoned all pretence of a "moral uplift" through women's vote, but ask indignantly why it should be looked for. And in Michigan, Mrs. Clara B. Arthur, leader of the suffrage campaign, said in the *Detroit News* of March 14, with reference to those who identified suffrage with prohibition: "They are confusing our efforts with the women who are active W.C.T.U. workers. That is their privilege, but the suffragists are not working with them to secure their ends."

"IF WOMEN had a chance to vote," says Margaret Foley, "we would not have any fire-trap buildings and our sisters jumping to the street to be picked up dead. If the women were given a chance they would soon remedy these matters." In this connection, it is interesting to note a statement by Eva Macdonald Walsh, President of the Woman's National Fire Prevention Association, in "Good Housekeeping": "It is estimated by experts that fifty per cent of the fires are due to individual carelessness, and the greater number are due to the carelessness of women, not of men... It is high time that our women should realize their responsibility in fire prevention; high time for them to get over the criminal carelessness that is responsible for the needless terrible annual sacrifice on the altar of fire."

THE REAL DANGER OF WOMAN SUFFRAGE

The writer stood on Fifth Avenue one night last November watching the Woman's Suffrage parade. It moved past him a giddy, fluttering mass of yellow, its bands playing popular airs, while the marchers kept time with their yellow jack o' lanterns hoisted on sticks. Their faces were wreathed in smiles, and now and again they broke into song as this or that popular tune caught their fancy. It was a veritable fairyland of dancing yellow.

Suddenly, the scene changed. The yellow was gone, and in its place was red,—red sashes, red banners, red hat-bands, red dresses. The light, gay music had died away, and there burst on the night air the solemn, stirring strains of the "Marseillaise," the famous revolutionary anthem. Men and women were marching past now, hundreds of them in close ranks, with firm, steady tread, determination written on their grim, set faces. All was red, red, red, and, as the writer gazed, stunned by the sudden, weird transformation, he saw displayed on their red banner the inscription,—**EVERY SOCIALIST IS A WOMAN SUFFRAGIST.**

Behind that giddy body of yellow suffragists came the compact mass of red-clad Socialists. Just so in our whole nation today. Socialists are behind Woman Suffrage and, if they should succeed in getting it, as the red suddenly flashed out in place of the yellow before the writer's eyes in the parade that November night, so will the Socialist Republic and the Co-operative Commonwealth burst forth close in the wake of Woman Suffrage.

Do you realize what this would mean? Do you appreciate what Socialism stands for?

In the Economic Revolution, the Socialists propose to do away with private productive property. The State will then own everything, and every one will work for the State for a living.

The Socialists call our present marriage ceremony "useless and ridiculous," and they intend to substitute for it "a mutual understanding" that

can be terminated by "quick, easy divorce at the will of either party." People will then "live like birds." In the place of our homes of today, they will give us one kitchen, one laundry, etc., for many so called families. They will even have state nurseries to take care of the children after they are a year old, while their mothers are out working for a living under the state.

Karl Marx, the Father of Socialism, speaks thus of the family and home life in "The Communist Manifesto":

"On what foundation is the present family based? On capital, on private gain. In its completely developed form, this family exists only among the bourgeoisie. But this state of things finds its complement in the practical absence of family among the proletarians (working class) and in public prostitution. The bourgeois family will vanish as a matter of course when its complement vanishes, and both will vanish with the vanishing of capital."

Already the Woman's Suffrage Party of Cook county, Illinois, of which Mrs. Charlotte Rhodus is President, have officially declared that "the sanctity of marriage is meaningless." They have addressed an open letter to the Illinois Legislature which states: "Under the regime of sanctity, ninety per cent of the race have become weaklings. Under sanctity white slavery has grown to astonishing proportions. The Church should cease to enforce its designs by means of a civil law;" and this same organization has made "easy divorce" its slogan.

The increasing Socialist vote in the suffrage states shows that the Socialists are right in identifying suffrage with socialism. And this is in pioneer communities, where Socialism makes a less powerful appeal than in the manufacturing districts and crowded cities of the East, where the Socialist gains would be even more rapid and startling, if women were given the vote. The Socialists have already opened naturalization bureaus in New York city for the purpose of making citizens of foreign-born women so they can vote for Socialism if they get the ballot. They are conducting an extensive campaign among women to educate them in Socialism.

Miss Jessie Ashley, who was Treasurer last year of the National Woman

Suffrage Association, discussing the question "Who are the White Slaves?" in the April number of "The Progressive Woman," a Socialist paper published in Chicago, says:

"By its (Society's) false standards of morality, its cruel mandates of 'virtue,' its harsh rules of ostracism for the girl who is not chaste, its wage system and its marriage system, and its system of male supremacy, it is itself the criminal. It holds its women, rich and poor alike, in sex slavery, and its working class men and women alike in wage slavery, and this the whole world over.

Slaves, every woman of them today, whether prostitutes held unwillingly, or prostitutes gone willingly 'astray,' whether submissive wife or rebellious virgin. Slaves every one, because there is no freedom of choice, but only a blind, cruel, stupid master, the social system, that without reason and without sympathy enslaves its womanhood."

The Progressive Woman has this to say editorially:

"GET SOMETHING DONE. Bring Socialism to the attention of women voters and suffragists. They are fighting for justice. And by fighting for justice they are fighting the capitalist system, which exists by injustice alone. ACT! MOVE! HUSTLE! for the realization of our slogan: A HALF MILLION SOCIALIST WOMEN VOTERS in 1916, and a 50 PER CENT WOMAN MEMBERSHIP in the Socialist party."

Daniel De Leon, one of the most prominent American Socialists, says: "All the facts, all the reasoning, focus into one conclusion. WOMAN SUFFRAGE must take its place as AN INTEGRAL SPLINTER in the torch that lights the path of the SOCIAL REVOLUTION."

There is no getting away from the fact that Woman Suffrage and Socialism are indissolubly linked. It is a state of affairs recognized by every serious student of political and social conditions today. Socialists like Inez Milholland, Mrs. Harriet Stanton Blatch, Alice Stone Blackwell and Jessie Ashley are prominent leaders in the woman suffrage party. All Socialists favor Woman Suffrage because they know what it means to their cause. We are indeed threatened by a red peril in a yellow cloak.

Where do you stand? Are you in favor of it? Do you care to see private property abolished? Do you agree with Miss Ashley that wife-

THE REMONSTRANCE.

hood is slavery? Do you think that the marriage ceremony is "useless and ridiculous"? Do you wish to have it done away with for "a mutual understanding" to be broken at the will of either party?

If you want these things, then work for Woman Suffrage with the Socialists. But, if you hold your family relations, your home, your religion, as sacred and inviolate, if you desire to preserve them for yourself and for your children for all time, then work with all your might against the companion, the handmaid, the forerunner of Socialism—Woman Suffrage.

G. M.

IN ILLINOIS

The Illinois legislature, in enacting a bill which gives to women the vote for presidential electors, municipal officers, and candidates for other "statutory offices" does not represent the sentiment of the people of that State.

Last fall, the suffragists tried hard to get enough signatures to a petition asking for the submission of the suffrage question to the voters under the so-called "public policy" Act. Only 100,000 signatures were needed; but the suffragists were able to get only 70,000, and this notwithstanding their offer of \$1.00 for every hundred names. Illinois has about one and a half million voters, so the suffrage petition represented less than 1 in 20.

At the Chicago primary in April, last year, when the voters expressed their opinion on the suffrage question, the anti-suffrage majority was nearly two to one,—71,354 in favor to 135,410 opposed—and every ward in the city declared against suffrage.

It was, doubtless, because they knew that public sentiment was overwhelmingly against them that the suffragists in Illinois abandoned their usual policy of asking for a constitutional amendment and worked instead for this partial measure, which does not require a popular vote.

The Attorney General of Illinois gives it as his official opinion that the Supreme Court of the State will declare the bill unconstitutional.

MR. GEORGE G. CROCKER

It is certainly fitting that our Association at this time should recognize the almost irreparable loss of a valued and honored friend in the recent death of Mr. George G. Crocker.

From the very beginning of the Anti-Suffrage work Mr. Crocker had been intimately associated with it and vitally interested in the cause. Indeed, it was he who inaugurated the work, as, in 1882, when a member of the Massachusetts Senate, he called upon the women of the State to take active measures of remonstrance against the extension of the suffrage to women. And later, when President of the Senate, he did all that was possible to help on our work. From that time, until now, he had been our first and foremost adviser, guide and friend.

Wise in counsel, calm in judgment, and moderate in opinion—instinctive as to the right, sensitive as to the wrong; a politician with a conscience, and a legislator with a heart,—his loss may well be called irreparable. He leaves with us an example of right-mindedness, of singleness of purpose, of unswerving honesty, which we must cherish—with all other citizens—but our Association ought especially to "think on these things" and to find in that example an incentive to maintain the high standard which he set for us, and to which it was his aim to keep us true.

E. L. H.

THE New York State Men's Association Opposed to Political Suffrage for Women, recently formed, will be an important factor in the anti-suffrage campaign in that state. Arthur B. Church is the secretary, and the following are members of the executive committee: Fritz Achelis, Frank L. Babbett, Cleveland H. Dodge, John R. Dos Passos, Charles S. Fairchild, George Douglass Miller, Louis T. Romaino, Professor Munroe Smith, Everett P. Wheeler, Dr. Talcott Williams and Frank S. Witherbee. The offices are at No. 15 William street, New York city.

MILITANCY SIXTY YEARS AGO

THE ancient cartoon, which is reproduced in this number of THE REMONSTRANCE, marks some of the earlier phases of the movement for "the emancipation of women" and suggests comparisons with the militant suffragism of today.

As long ago as 1851, there were "hikes" and street demonstrations by restless women, not unlike those that have been witnessed this year on the march to Albany and in the parade at Washington. The "Bloomers" of those days were the forerunners of the Pankhursts of today. Arrayed in what was known as "the costume à la Turque" they sought to get into the limelight and to win notoriety,—and they succeeded, as this cartoon shows.

The cartoonist aimed his shaft at a Bloomer demonstration at Lowell, on the 4th of July, 1851,—a demonstration which in spite of unfavorable weather, was participated in by several hundred women. Similar demonstrations, on a smaller scale, were made on the same day at Hartford and elsewhere.

The banners which the cartoonist puts into the hands of the Bloomer paraders, and the inscriptions with which the buildings in view are decorated have a curiously modern import. The water-wagon in the left foreground bears the familiar legend "Emancipation." On the building at the left is the sign "Asylum and Nursery for Abandoned Children" and on that at the right the sign "Infantry Barracks & Boarding House." On one banner are the words "No More Ladies and Gentlemen—We All are Men," on a second "No More House-keeping," on a third "No More Sewing, Washing and Ironing Done" and on a fourth, only partly visible at the extreme right, "No More Babies."

All of which suggests that the folly and frenzy which found expression in the Bloomer movement sixty years ago were not so very different from some of the present-day manifestations of the more extreme type of suffragists.

Ms. TURKEY not abated by the failure of her first attempt in Gotham, takes the command of the Bloomer Brigade, and supported by the *Waterbury*, gives Battle to Public Opinion at Lowell on the 4th of July 1851.

ANNUAL MEETING OF THE ASSOCIATION

The annual meeting of the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women was held at the Tuileries, Boston, April 23d, Mrs. James M. Codman, Acting President, in the chair. There was a large attendance of members from all parts of the state.

Mrs. Codman made a short address of welcome and congratulation on the rapidly increasing membership, and the enthusiasm manifested for the cause. She spoke of the large amount of literature sent out from THE REMONSTRANCE office, and of the increasing number of men enrolled in the Men's Anti-Suffrage Association. She announced with much regret that Miss Ames had felt obliged to resign as President, because of ill health. As Miss Ames's letter had been received too late for the Executive Committee to take action, Mrs. Codman had agreed to remain Acting President for a time.

Mrs. William Lowell Putnam proposed a vote of thanks to Miss Ames and Mrs. Codman for their untiring and valuable services in the work of the Association. A rising vote was taken with much enthusiasm. Mrs. Putnam proposed that Mrs. Codman be chosen President, and the vote was unanimous. Mrs. Codman accepted, although with reluctance at undertaking this new responsibility, and so, of necessity, giving up the office of Treasurer, which she had held for eleven years.

Mrs. Putnam gave an interesting report of the work of the Education and Organization Committee during the past year, which had been a very active and encouraging one. There had been a net gain of 2,005 members, which was nearly twice the gain of the preceding year, and there had been more press and publicity work than ever before. About 98,000 pieces of literature had been sent out, including 27,470 copies of THE REMONSTRANCE; and 15 new branches had been formed. In closing her report, Mrs. Putnam said: "Public opinion, not the ballot, is the great force in the world today, and public opinion requires organization to make it effective. We want to strengthen our organization this year until we cover every town of any importance in the state."

Dr. Ernest Bernbaum, of the English Department of Harvard University, spoke in emphatic denial of the assertion that woman suffrage is in accord with the tendencies of the age. He argued that the drift is decidedly in the opposite direction in government, economics, sociology, education and other fields; and he cited the great increase in the duties of the voter by reason of more intricate problems and more frequent elections, the economic pressure which promotes specialization, the tendency, not toward the economic independence of women but the interdependence of the family, the recognition of the home by modern sociologists as greatly superior to the institutional care of children, and the drift away from co-education as evidence that suffragist theories run counter to actual progress.

Mrs. A. J. George was then introduced, and gave a brief account of her work in other states. She had represented the Massachusetts Association in eleven states and the District of Columbia during the last few months, and spoke especially of the campaigns in New Hampshire, Michigan, and Pennsylvania and the work at Washington.

Officers were elected as follows: President, Mrs. James M. Codman; Vice-Presidents, Miss Anna L. Dawes, Mrs. Charles E. Guild, Mrs. Charles D. Homans, Miss Agnes Irwin, Mrs. Francis C. Lowell, Mrs. Robert S. Russell and Mrs. Henry M. Whitney; Treasurer, pro tem., Mrs. James M. Codman, Walnut Street, Brookline; Recording Secretary, Miss E. C. Post; Corresponding Secretary, Mrs. Charles P. Strong. Executive Committee, The Officers and Miss Mary S. Ames, Mrs. Robert Bradley, Mrs. Edward B. Cole, Mrs. J. Randolph Coolidge, Miss Sarah H. Crocker, Miss Elizabeth H. Houghton, Miss Elizabeth Johnson, Mrs. Henry P. Kidder, Mrs. Herbert Lyman, Mrs. Augustin H. Parker, Mrs. William Lowell Putnam, Mrs. Benjamin L. Robinson, Mrs. Richard M. Saltonstall, Miss Evelyn Sears, Miss Elizabeth P. Sohler and Mrs. Barrett Wendell.

SOME "MAN-MADE" LAWS

Legislation for the protection of women and children was enacted by a number of state legislatures in 1912.

In Maryland, the minimum age law was raised. In Minnesota, the child

labor law was redrafted. In Louisiana and New York, the laws relating to child labor were strengthened. In New Mexico laws were passed fixing the minimum age of employment. In Rhode Island and South Carolina, laws of this description were amended. The interests of women and children were taken into account in Massachusetts in the statute establishing the Minimum Wage Commission. In Kentucky, laws relating exclusively to the employment of women were passed. In New Jersey, a maximum hours of employment law was enacted.

These are all male-suffrage states, and the laws were all "man-made" laws, enacted without the exercise of the slightest political power on the part of women.

The Texas legislature this year enacted a severe Wife Abandonment Act; an act limiting the working hours of women; a Married Women's Property Rights Act; an act creating a State Bureau of Child and Animal Protection; an act creating a training school for delinquent girls; and an act making the previously enacted Juvenile Court law effective and broadening its provisions. No previous legislature had enacted so many laws for the protection of women and children. Yet this very legislature, reaching out in all directions to improve the lot of women and children, rejected by a strong vote a proposed woman suffrage amendment.

In view of this record, what becomes of the claim that woman's vote is needed to protect women's interests?

A DEFENCE OF MILITANCY

(Mrs. Sarah Devlin, President of the Fairhaven, Conn., Political Equality Club)

What are a few smashed windows and a bruised face on some Count-of-no-Account? What's the explosion of some fire crackers compared to a cause to abandon slavery? Compare the bloodshed of the civil war to the bloodshed in England by the militants. Compare the raids of Sherman and Grant to the raids of the militants,—both with the same aim, abolition of slavery. How foolish, how unthoughtful to say 'This should not be done, and that ought not to be done.'

A WOMAN'S "JOB"

(Kate Douglas Wiggin, (Mrs. Riggs) at the Senate Committee Hearing at Washington, April 19, 1913)

I am probably an Anti-Suffragist by instinct and temperament, but all the experience of my busy life has confirmed my natural attitude of mind. I would not, for the world, retard the development of woman, nor hamper her in her struggle for still greater freedom than she now possesses, though to my mind she has not at any time gone to the limit of her powers under present conditions, but I cannot believe that the ballot is the first, or the next, or the best thing to work for. I want her to be a good homemaker, a good mother and a loyal, intelligent, active citizen, but above all to be a helpful, stimulating, inspiring force in the world, rather than a useful and influential factor in politics. I do not question a woman's ability to concentrate her mind on political questions; to grow steadily in knowledge and power and to vote wisely and conscientiously; but I should prefer her to develop still higher powers, for there are higher ones! It is even more difficult to be an inspiring woman than a good citizen and an honest voter, and if you declare your ability to be all three, I shall continue to believe that the first of the three will continually be lost in the development of the other two. Nobody can say that the service of local or national government demands as consecrated a use of a woman's powers as the service of humanity.

A woman's "job" to my mind, is with other women, with children, and with men, who, next to children are most dependent upon what she thinks, and says, and does, and is. Her peculiar "job" I say is with men, women and children, their bodies, their hearts and their souls. I would have woman strong enough to bear the burden of the weak; to rescue and educate derelicts; to make life cleaner, safer, saner, more upright than it is now. I would have her strong enough to keep just a trifle in the background; she spoils the composition of many a good picture just now, by wanting the centre of the stage and all the limelight that the electrician can furnish; but the limelight never makes anything grow, it only causes the thing to look a little other than it is. If woman is as strong as she ought to be she should be called continually in council, to advise, to con-

sult and cooperate with men wherever her peculiar gifts are valuable; if she enjoys and uses these rights and privileges she does not need the ballot.

REFORMS AND THE VOTE

To the Editor of THE REMONSTRANCE:

The most important claim of the suffragists is that as soon as women have the vote, all sorts of reforms will at once be accomplished. Now, no reforms are brought about without hard work, and a great deal of self sacrifice by those who have them at heart. One vote never yet brought about a reform. Public opinion must be on the side of the reformers, and that necessitates hard work in awakening sufficient interest among the inert. This will be even more difficult when women have votes than when they are working as they are now with no partisan politics dividing them.

Now when women go to a legislature to ask for any special reforms, being non-partisan, they are listened to with sincere attention and respect by men of all parties. Mrs. George W. Townsend's account of how the equal guardianship law was passed in New York is a case in point. She wrote as president of the Women's Educational Union:

"Knowing that the woman suffragists had been working for long years to secure equal guardianship, our Union was especially careful that the Suffrage Association should not know of the Union's effort until after the law was passed. I remember that a prominent suffragist called to see me as soon as she heard of it, and said, 'How did you accomplish this great good and not let us know?' And I answered, 'Because we did not let you know.' I think I was justified in saying that, because many men in both houses were so opposed to woman suffrage that they would not have voted for our bills. The guardianship bill was passed without a negative vote in either house.....The work was done in a systematic manner. Circulars giving full information in regard to laws in other states, and as to what we desired to accomplish, and reasons therefor, were sent to every legislator. There was no lobbying, and, in fact, it was not necessary for me to go to Albany at all."

She went on to say:

"All this required knowledge, and hard unselfish work—most of the suf-

fragists are neither unselfish nor inclined to hard work. It is no trouble to make rash statements and promises from a platform. Talking is easy, and half truths are more misleading, or shall I say, more convincing, than direct mis-statements."

Banquets, parades and mass meetings are fun and most exciting. Experiencing Pankhurst is a delightful sensation for those emotionally inclined, and if you really are swept off your feet and cast a few rings and pins into the collection boxes (always handy by) it is for the cause and much more fun than staying at home and taking care of the children. Let the husbands or maiden aunts, or any other unselfish and unemotional persons do that. They wouldn't enjoy parading half as much as a young, progressive, up-to-date suffragette, and they take much better care of the children. Humdrum pursuits like charity work or the care of small children do not interest a modern suffragist—No—the development of herself is her only concern. Let Anti-Suffragists work for reforms if they like, Suffragists will not so waste their time because, according to them, as soon as they have votes and can drop ballots in a box all reforms will accomplish themselves. Not one among them ever tells us how the ballot is to have this effect, which it has never yet had anywhere in the world, they merely reiterate that it will have it. It seems only fair to ask them HOW?

CAROLINE M. PARKER.

WHEN SO moderate a body as the Boston Central Woman's Christian Temperance Union tables a resolution condemning the violence of the English suffragettes, it would appear that American sympathy with militancy is extending rapidly.

MRS. WILLIAM SPENCER MURRAY, President of the New Haven Women's Political Union, in the New Haven Journal-Courier for May 2, said, "The suffrage cause has only two real opponents in America, ignorance and organized vice." The nearly 20,000 members of the Massachusetts Association Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women will be interested in this easy and courteous classification.

State Organizations Opposed to the Further Extension of Suffrage to Women.

MASSACHUSETTS

Sixty-two Branch Committees; 19,654 members in 375 cities, towns, and villages.

MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, President.
MISS ANNA L. DAWES.
MRS. CHARLES ELIOT GUILD.
MRS. CHARLES D. HOMANS.
MISS AGNES IRWIN.
MRS. FRANCIS C. LOWELL.
MRS. ROBERT S. RUSSELL.
MRS. HENRY M. WHITNEY.
MRS. JAMES M. CODMAN, Treasurer
pre tem., Walnut Street, Brookline.
MISS M. C. POST, Rec. Sec'y.
MRS. CHARLES P. STRONG, Cor. Sec'y.
Room 615, Kensington Building, Boston.

Vice-Presidents.

* Not present membership of women over 21 years of age; eliminating those names which the Association has lost from deaths, resignations, and removals from the club.

CONNECTICUT

MRS. DANIEL A. MARKHAM, President.
MRS. ALBERT S. COOK, Treasurer.
MRS. WALTER S. SCHULE, Hartford, Secretary.

ILLINOIS

MRS. CAROLINE F. CORBIN, President.
MISS J. C. FAIRFIELD, Treasurer.
MRS. GEORGE W. KRETZINGER, Recording Secretary.

IOWA COMMITTEE

MRS. MARTIN FLYNN, President.
MRS. SIMON CASADY, Secretary.

MARYLAND

MRS. ROBERT GARRETT, President.
MISS KATHERINE P. DAVIS, Corresponding Secretary.
MRS. CLAUDE HALL, Recording Secretary.
MRS. CHARLES B. PENROSE, Treasurer.

MAINE COMMITTEE

MRS. SIDNEY W. THAXTER, Portland, Secretary.
MRS. CHARLES S. OGDEN.
MRS. JAMES P. BAXTER.
MRS. CLARENCE H. CORNING.
MRS. F. A. QUIMBY.
MISS LOUISA SPRING.
MISS CATHERINE P. TALBOT.
MISS HANNAH L. TALBOT.
MISS MARY KING LONGFELLOW.
MISS ELINOR S. MOODY.
MISS MARION RICHMOND WEEKS.
MRS. JOHN M. GLIDDEN, Newcastle.
MRS. F. M. BLAKE, Bangor.
MRS. F. C. ROBINSON, Brunswick.

MICHIGAN

MRS. HENRY F. LYSTER, President.
MRS. JAMES COSSLETT SMITH, Treasurer.
MISS HELEN E. KEEF, Secretary.
MRS. WILLIAM S. JEROME, Corresponding Secretary.

NEW HAMPSHIRE ASSOCIATION

MRS. A. T. DUDLEY, Exeter, President.
MRS. OTIS G. HAMMOND, Recording Secretary.
MISS GRACE MORRILL, Corresponding Secretary.
MISS CARRY R. TODD, Treasurer.

NEW JERSEY

MRS. E. YARDE BREWER, President.
MISS JULIA MINNEGERODE, Corresponding Secretary.
MISS ANNE de B. MACILVAINE, Recording Secretary.
MRS. J. M. FORST, Treasurer.

NEW YORK

MISS ALICE HILL CHITTENDEN, President.
MRS. M. E. LOONIS, Secretary.
MRS. JOHN A. CHURCH, Treasurer.

OHIO

MRS. H. E. TALBOT, Dayton, President.
Vice-Presidents.
MRS. JOSEPH CRANE, Dayton.
MRS. JOHN M. GUNDEY, Cleveland.
MRS. HELEN M. LUCAS, Marietta.
MRS. FRANK RAY, Granville.

PENNSYLVANIA

MRS. HORACE BROOK, President.
MISS ELSIE BALCH, Treasurer.
MRS. BRINTON COKE, Corresponding Secretary.
MRS. CHARLES BINGHAM PENROSE, Recording Secretary.
MISS LAURA M. SLOAN, General Secretary.

RHODE ISLAND

MRS. ROWLAND G. HASARD, President.
MRS. A. G. HARKNESS, Secretary.
MRS. ELISHA H. HOWARD, Treasurer.
Newport Branch.
MRS. CHARLES WEAVER, Chairman.
MRS. ERNEST HOWE, Secretary.

VERMONT

MRS. BROOKES BROWN, President.
MRS. M. H. BUCKHAM, Burlington, Secretary.
MRS. CLARENCE MORGAN, Treasurer.

VIRGINIA

MISS JANE M. RUTHERFORD, President.
MRS. CHARLES M. FERRELL, Secretary.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

MRS. ARTHUR DUNN, President.
MISS McMULLEN, Treasurer.
MISS C. L. HARMOLD, Secretary.

WISCONSIN

Madison Branch.
MRS. FRANK W. HOYT, President.
MRS. JOSEPH W. HOBBS, Treasurer.
MISS GENEVIEVE MILLS, Corresponding Secretary.

NOTES ON SUFFRAGE AND ANTI-SUFFRAGE

IT WAS an interesting coincidence that, on the day before the Connecticut House of Representatives defeated a suffrage amendment by a two-to-one majority, there was a school election in Hartford, in which only 95 women, out of 1040 who had registered, and about 18,000 who might have done so, took the trouble to vote. Was it only a coincidence, or was it partly cause and effect?

GOVERNOR MCGOVERN of Wisconsin is bitterly denounced by the suffragists as an ally of the brewers because he vetoed the bill providing for a new submission of the proposed suffrage amendment. But, called upon to sign such a bill only six months after the voters had rejected the amendment by a majority of more than 91,000, Governor McGovern was justified in concluding that there was no excuse for troubling the voters again with it.

THE MAYOR of Berkeley, California, is a zealous suffragist, but the result of a recent election in that city moved him to say:

"Here in California we have woman suffrage, and Berkeley is one of the star centres of that movement. Surely adequate playground facilities for 7,000 children is a subject for woman's thought and vote, and yet,

out of 8,000 women voters, only about 1,500 cared enough to vote on this important subject."

"IT HAS never been known in the history of politics, no matter how corrupt the political parties have been in the past, that such low and unfair methods have been adopted by individuals to get control of an organization." No, inquiring reader. These words are not a part of a charge aimed at Tammany. They are the preamble to a resolution adopted by the New Haven Political Equality Club, May 5, expelling 12 members, including the president and an honorary vice-president. And so the cause of political uplift, through the agency of women, moves on.

ENGLISH MILITANTS have made light of the new law which they describe as a "Cat and Mouse Act," but its practical application may be less amusing. Under the new law, a prisoner who weakens herself by a "hunger strike" will be released until she has recovered her strength, and will then be sent back to serve out the remainder of the term for which she was sentenced. This is quite a different matter from securing unconditional release by a few days' abstinence from food. As the new law applies to men and women alike, the militants cannot complain of discrimination.

DR. ANNA SHAW has thought it wise to disavow Mrs. Belmont's threat of the adoption of militancy in this country. Yet, in an address before the Philadelphia Woman Suffrage Society, March 15, 1912, Dr. Shaw was reported as declaring for militant suffrage for America, under certain conditions; and the next day, in an interview with the Philadelphia correspondent of the New York Times, she explained her meaning as follows, according to a despatch in that paper:

"If we are played with, made fun of, just tolerated, greeted with supercilious smiles by members of Congressional committees, there is nothing for us to do but to resort to militant methods. We hope we will not be driven to measures as severe as those used in England, but, if it does come, the daughters of old English sires will be ready to suffer here as women are suffering in England."